DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 812 CE 045 287

TITLE Assessment of Follow-Up Research. Final Report 1985-1986.
INSTITUTION Miami-Dade Community Coll., Fla.
SPONS AGENCY Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Div. of Vocational, Adult, and Community Education.
PUB DATE 29 Aug 86
NOTE 53p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Information; *Community Colleges; Data Collection; Field Tests; *Followup Studies; Higher Education; *Information Sources; Job Placement; Program Improvement; Research Methodology; *Research Problems; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Employer Surveys; *Florida

ABSTRACT

A project was undertaken to develop and field-test new methodologies for collecting follow-up and placement data on completers of Miami-Dade Community College (MDCC). Strategies used in the study included exploration of such nontraditional data sources as in- and out-of-state private university transfers, state university system tapes for all academic quarters, and Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) files; a reexamination of the existing right-to-privacy act and existing company disclosure policies; and development of a new research instrument that was designed to collect data suited to institutional needs. This instrument, which was called the Employer Evaluation Scale, was pilot tested with a sample of 131 employers. Contact with 10 in-state private institutions yielded data for 436 MDCC transfers, and 7 out-of-state universities showed a total of 268 MDCC transfers. It was discovered that INS files are available only to federal agencies. The pilot test of the Employer Evaluation Scale revealed that whereas company disclosure policies tend to inhibit data collection, employers' interpretations of existing privacy legislation tends to further data collection. The determination as to whether state university system tapes will be available for distribution is still pending. (The 14 appendixes to this report include the revised version of the Employer Evaluation Scale, a survey of former students, various project forms and correspondence, and comments by employers for program consideration.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED275812

FL8613108

Final Report
Project No. 132-15260-2G75
1985-1986

Assessment of Follow-up Research

Miami-Dade Community College
11011 SW 104 Street
Miami, Florida 33176

Anne Baldwin
Project Director

August 29, 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D M. Duat

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 045-287

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	iii
Introduction	
The Background	1
The Problem	1
Objectives and Methods of the Study	3
Findings	
Unknown Status	
In-State Private Colleges and Universities	4
Out-of-State Universities	6
Immigration and Naturalization Services Files	8
The State University System Student Course Files	9
Employer Survey	
Reactions of Administrators of Occupational Programs to the "Employer Evaluation Scale"	9
Company Disclosure Policy and Privacy Act	11
The Employer Evaluation Scale	12
Employer Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale	15
Discussion	29
Appendices	
Appendix A: Postal Mailer	31
Appendix B: Data Request to Institutions Outside of the SUS	32
Appendix C: Transfer Students from Miami-Dade Community College	33
Appendix D: U. S. Department of Justice Student Status Form	34
Appendix E: Reaction Request to Adminstrators	35
Appendix F: Reaction to the Employer Evaluation Scale	36
Appendix G: Request to Employers for Data	37
Appendix H: Employer Evaluation Scale (revised version)	38
Appendix I: Memorandum - Subject: Contacting Employers of Former Students (January 15, 1979)	40
Appendix J: Memorandum - Subject: Contacting Employers of Former Students (January 30, 1979)	41
Appendix K: Survey of Former Students	42
Appendix L: Permission to Obtain Employer Evaluation Data	44
Appendix M: Employer Follow-up Form	45
Appendix N: Comments by Employers for Program Consideration	46

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1: Private Institutions of Higher Learning in Florida Contacted for 1985-86 M-DCC Transfers 5

Table 2: Out-of-State Institutions of Higher Learning Contacted for 1983-84 to 1985-86 M-DCC Transfers 7

Table 3: Summary of Reactions to the Employer Evaluation Scale by Administrators of Occupational Programs 10

Table 4: Population Characteristics of Programs Surveyed with the Employer Evaluation Scale 14

Table 5: Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale for the Aggregation of Programs 16

Table 6: Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale for the Nursing ADN Program 19

Table 7: Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale for the Executive Secretary Program 21

Table 8: Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale for the Business Data Processing Program 23

Table 9: Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale for the Electronics Technology Program 25

Table 10: Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale for the Fire Science Program 27

ABSTRACT

Title of Project:	Assessment of Follow-up Research
Organization:	Miami-Dade Community College
Project Director:	Anne Baldwin
Expenditures:	$3,542.00
Duration of Project:	October 1, 1985 - August 29, 1986.

Problem

A number of problems are inherent to follow-up studies and defy conventional methods of tracking students. Specific approaches commonly used--- surveys, State University System data tapes, Commerce tapes, phone calls, and exit interviews -- while invaluable, present their own limitations. These limitations, most often evident in large metropolitan community colleges, result in underreporting of data such that success ratios for placement of graduates are misleading and inaccurate.

Objectives

The pervasive purpose of this project was to develop new methodologies and to field test these methodologies in order to increase the accuracy of Placement and Follow-up data supplied to the State.

Procedures

Strategies utilized involved the exploration of non-traditional sources for data --- in-state private university transfers, out-of-state university transfers, SUS Winter, Spring/Summer Term tapes, Immigration and Naturalization Services files. The "Right to Privacy Act" and "Company Disclosure Policy" were reexamined. A new research instrument was designed to collect data suited to institutional needs.

Results and Potentialities

Contact with ten in-state private Florida institutions yielded data for 436 MDCC transfers. Seven out-of-state universities showed a total of 268 MDCC transfers. INS files are available only to federal agencies. The interpretation of the "Right to Privacy Act" furthers data collection while the "Company Disclosure Policy" inhibits data collection. SUS Winter and Spring/Summer tape distribution are pending. The newly designed Employer Evaluation Scale instrument produced useful monitoring data as well as state-of-the-art and state-of-the-market data. Findings posed numerous issues for furtherance of research in this domain. Research reports for replication and issue definitions are available from the Office of Institutional Research, Miami-Dade Community College, Miami, Florida 33176.

ASSESSMENT OF FOLLOW-UP RESEARCH

(A Federal Vocational Grant Project
No. 132-15260-6-2G75)

Introduction

The Background

Follow-up studies are conducted annually by post-secondary institutions across the United States. These accountability studies concern the job status and continuing education status of former occupational students. These students may have completed a degree/certificate or may have left the institution after having completed 25% of the training program. Regulations regarding follow-up at the local community college level derive from either State and/or Federal mandates. The general nature of laws whether Federal or State is made specific through particular rules promulgated by the funding agency. Seven Federal/State statutes and regulations directly or indirectly govern what shall be expected of the individual community colleges. Briefly, they deal with:

1. (§ 104.402c) The State Plan regarding employer satisfaction with vocational education employee training as a reflection of the college's program quality. The level of satisfaction is compared to that of other employees in the same position who received no program training.

2. (§ 104.404) Definition of students to be tracked.

3. (§ 2312) The edict that the State will conduct reviews analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of funded vocational education programs.

4. (PL 94-482) The allotment formula and conditions for fund authorization.

5. (CH 78-401,§ 1,Item 376) Development of a plan to effect comparability of vocational education follow-up data.

6. (Amendment to 6A-14.55) Responsibility of follow-up studies at the individual community colleges.

7. (Amendment to § 229.551) Revision of the definition of the population for which colleges are accountable for "successful placement." Automatic reviews, procedures, consequences, and time frame (for the 70% compliance) are specified.

The Problem

A number of problems associated with mandates are inherent to follow-up studies and defy conventional methods of tracking students. Specific procedures commonly used are 1) surveys, 2) State University System (SUS) tapes, 3) Department of Commerce data tapes, 4) telephone calls, and 5) exit interviews. Each of these procedures, while invaluable, has its

own limitations. An outline of limitations is herein encapsulated. Surveys are conducted two major semesters after the student leaves the college. The rationale in setting the survey time frame considered practical matters such as allowing sufficient time lapse between date of graduation and acquisition of employment. Coupled with the time interval is the transitory nature of the student population of nearly all community colleges. Many surveys fail to reach their destination because of the time lapse and residential mobility of students.

Recognizing the constraints of surveys mailed a year after graduation, Miami-Dade Community College (MDCC) applied two time frame variations. First, the switch from the letter survey (which is normally done in late March of the year succeeding graduation) to the abbreviated postal mailer (Appendix A) occurred during the pre-Thanksgiving and pre-Christmas period. The three mailouts were planned for this span based on a review of the literature and empirical claims of other institutions. Expected was a substantially higher return rate founded on the mailing time (maximal home contact of the graduates) and the quickness of reponse to the instrument.

Results received are as follows:

	Grad Year	No. Sent	No. Responded	% Response
Letter	1983-84	1,492	819	54.9
Postcard	1984-85	1,095	345	31.5

Because the return rate was so low in mid-December after the second mailout, it was decided that the Christmas rushes and stresses would militate against responding to the mailer. Therefore, the third wave of mailings took place in late March. Even with this adjustment, the mailer response rate was 31.5% as opposed to the letter of 54.9%.

The second time frame variation and procedure regarding the survey was effected thrcugh administrative decision and cooperation of the registrar's office. All students applying for graduation are requested to complete the questionnaire. Limitations with this method of data collection are 1) variability of interest among campus offices, 2) possible outdatedness of emplyment data from time of collection to state report due date, and 3) instability of continuing education plans.

The SUS tapes are an opening Fall Term snapshot of upper division enrollments. Excluded from the State tapes are continuing education data of students attending private universities and out-of-state institutions. Department of Commerce and Labor tapes are run during the third quarter. Like the SUS tapes, these data are also captured and frozen at one specific point in time. Those persons employed after this tape run are excluded from the data base, as might be expected.

The telephone,as a method of tracking students or following-up on survey non-responses poses certain obstacles. Oftentimes, numbers are no longer valid. Among the valid number non-contact calls, it can be assumed

that the individual might possibly be reached at night. Daytime employment of MDCC students and graduates precludes the day call from getting through.

Exit interviews are successfully used for those students who withdraw during the course of the semester. The majority of Leavers, however, complete the semester, don't rematriculate thereafter and are thence unlocatable. Occupational graduates, with the exception of specific medical programs tend to be less responsive to surveys than Associate in Arts graduates.

To augment these traditional methods, MDCC developed an elaborate method of maximizing the value of the Division of Community College's Feedback tape data. This was done through the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code. This broad industrial SIC code was used to determine job relationship to training through constructing a bridge between MDCC occupational program codes and the SIC code. The chairpersons of occupational programs were indispensable in this regard. With the commonly used methods and the table of code matches, MDCC has been able to determine the placement status of approximately 80% of its graduates. Until Non-Resident Aliens were removed from the pool of Completers as an option, MDCC was disadvantaged in having to follow-up the largest foreign student population in the nation. These students were difficult to track once they left the institution or the country. Nearly 8% of MDCC occupational graduates are on (F-1) student visas. Respondent Non-Resident Aliens employed in field or continuing education were part of the 80% known status component reported previously.

Clearly, while these traditional methods are the mainstay of data collection, accountability responsibilities dictated that investigations along supplmental lines be pursued.

Objectives and Methods of the Study

The pervasive, overriding purpose of the Assessment of Follow-up Research federal vocational grant was to develop methodologies and to field-test these methodologies in order to determine the methodological feasibility of increasing the accuracy of data supplied to the State of Florida Department of Education Division of Community Colleges. Accuracy focus proceeded along two lines. First, attempts were made to reduce the number and percent of those falling into the unknown placement status category. Second, the bias inherent in the present Employer Follow-up survey was investigated and efforts were channeled into producing more representative results.

With regard to the first objective, research and planning were aimed at looking into alternative and supplemental means of capturing data to reduce the unknown placement status (20%) of MDCC graduates. It was hypothesized that for programs marginal to the State Program Review success ratio of 70%, locating these "missing persons" could be critical to program viability. The methods explored and field-tested (where applicable) included the following populations:

1) In-state private college and university transfers
2) Out-of-state transfers
3) Immigration and Naturalization Services files Visa students
4) SUS Student Course Files transfers.

Additionally, using findings from this facet of the project, the issue of the unknown status category will be pursued on the State level with the end of developing a "forgiveness ratio" beyond a reasonable known placement rate. For example, if reasonable effort to locate graduates is demonstrated (at least 85% located), the remaining 15% of unknowns can be distributed using the known placement of the located group.

The second objective was directed at developing an employer follow-up scale that would yield data reflecting the needs of employers and which would suggest areas for program improvement. To this end, the Employer Evaluation Scale was developed. The population on which this instrument was field-tested consisted of five major programs covering a variety of fields. The population was further delineated by inclusion of only those employers within these fields who 1) were not surveyed in the 1985-86 report year using the State's Employer Follow-up Form, 2) among those surveyed did not respond, and 3) had graduates in programs related to their field of training. This more "difficult population" constituted the data base for the employer portion of the study. In conjunction with the employer survey, reactions to the "Right to Privacy Act" and the "Company Disclosure Policy." were reexamined.

Findings

The findings of this project are organized into the two major efforts described....unknown status and employer survey.

Unknown Status

1. In-State Private Universities

Graduates who do not respond to the three mailouts of the State required survey of former students and who are not on the SUS tape, by default, become part of the unknown status category. Empirical though unsummarized evidence across years reveal that MDCC students transfer to private institutions of higher learning. In attempting to obtain hard data, twelve private institutions of higher learning in Florida were contacted (Table 1). Data requested appeared simple and straightforward----name of student and Social Security Number for transfer enrollment in 1985-86 (Appendix B,C). It was intended that these data elements would be matched against MDCC demographic files for particulars. Ten of the contacted institutions responded with data in formats programmed for or allowable by their systems.

As the column labeled "Disposition of M-DCC Transfers" suggests, institutions have different computer capacities and data generation limitations. Limitations with respect to Institutional Research requests might be that institutions 1) do not

Table 1

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING
IN FLORIDA
CONTACTED FOR M-DCC TRANSFERS
IN 1985-86

Institution	Disposition of M-DCC Transfers
Barry University	97 records
Bethune Cookman	2 transfers
Florida Institute of Technology	9 transfers from M-DCC
Florida Memorial College	159 names, no years designated
Jacksonville University	2 1985-86 transfers
Miami Christian College	2 students
Nova University	No computer capability for sort by college
Saint Leo College	Did not follow through on intentions
St. Thomas University	54 records for 1985-86
Stetson University	2 students
University of Miami	96 enrollments
University of Tampa	3 students
Total Transfers	436

Number of private in-state institutions contacted	12
Number of these institutions responding	10
Percent of responses	83

keep or ask for information about previous schools attended for their electronic files, 2) can only give gross aggregate by year, 3) have no sort capacity, 4) have no electronic files, 5) file transcripts from transferring institutions in order of receipt with or without social security numbers, and 6) have no year of transfer designated.

From these ten private Florida four year institutions of higher learning, 436 former MDCC students were found. However, even when given transfer enrollments from MDCC for 1985-86 with student name and social security numbers, matches against MDCC files were low for graduates in 1983-84 and 1984-85. A check of the 1985-86 graduates showed that the largest numbers of enrollments for this cohort were found at the University of Miami and St. Thomas University. Though Florida Memorial College showed 159 names and Barry University showed 97 records, matches against designated years were minimal.

To verify the possibility that non-matches were Leavers, State defined Leavers files were checked for 1983-84 and 1984-85. Data also showed low matches. Thus far, we know that there were 436 transfers from MDCC to ten private four-year institutions. We also know that most are not 1983-84, 1984-85 Completers or Leavers. Time strictures do not permit knowing, at this point, the actual year of graduation or departure from MDCC or the exact year of matriculation in the upper levels. It is possible, as is characteristic of community college students that a period of "dropping out" occurred before enrollment in these institutions took place. The size of these non-matches leads the writer to believe that these persons can be found in files prior to 1983-84. Another possible explanation of non-matches may be the name changes of female students as their marital status changed. Time prevented the programming for and investigation of "back-year" data.

2. Out-of-State Universities

Self-reported data from among respondees to past years Placement and Follow-up surveys of former students show transfers to out-of-state universities. Another source of transfer information has been those reported in "Serving the Superior Student" by George Emerson, Director of the College Honors Program at MDCC South. The selected institutions in Table 2 were compiled from these sources. Seventy-one percent (or 10 out of 14) of these institutions responded to requests for names of MDCC transferees to their campuses in 1983-84 through 1985-86. System limitations again influenced the number of students found and the latitude for data interpretation. Out-of-state transfer records may not be kept, names may not be released without the student's permission, only aggregate data may have been available, and record keeping may be campus responsibility in multi-complex universities (64 centers at the State University of N. Y.).

Table 2

OUT-OF-STATE
INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING
CONTACTED FOR 1984-86 M-DCC TRANSFERS

Institution	Disposition of M-DCC transfers
Alabama A & M University	No response
Alabama State University	2 students 1983-84, 1 in 1984
California State University	No out-of-state tracking system
Georgetown University	Student permission needed for name release
Georgia State University	114 students 1983-84 thru 1985-86
Indiana University	No response
Loyola Unversity (New Orleans)	17 from 1984-1986
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	No response
Purdue University	104; 51 since 1979, 53 prior to 1979
Smith College	2 students; 1 in 1983, 1 in 1985
State University of N. Y.	Need to contact 64 decentralized centers
University of Chicago	8 transfers, 3 in grad sch of Business, Divinity, Medicine
University of Pennsylvania	No response
University of South Carolina	21 students 1983-84 through 1985-86
Total Transfers	268

Number contacted	14
Number responded	10
Percent of responses	71

What can be conservatively stated overall, is that there were 268 students found in responses from seven universities. Though there were 104 transfers to Purdue University and 114 to Georgia State University, hits for the years in question were low. Among the non-respondent institutions, Emerson reported two scholarship students (1985) in Avionics and Computer Engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 3 students (1985) at Georgetown University, and a scholarship student (1985) in the School of Engineering at the University of Pennsylvania. This small body of data suggests that were time and resources available, the exploration of other out-of-state universities would reveal more transfers from MDCC.

3. The Immigration and Naturalization Services

Until the 1984-85 State Report Year, community colleges in the State of Florida were required to report placement data for its Non-Resident Alien (NRA) graduations of the Associate in Science and Planned Certificate programs. This placed MDCC at a disadvantage on two counts: 1) in having the largest population of NRA among instituions of higher education in the United States for which accountability was required, and 2) in tracking a highly transient population. The accountability needs motivated an investigation into the possibility of obtaining immigration department location data of NRAs who fell into the unknown placement status category. In 1984-85 the U. S. Department of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) initiated the use of the Student Status Form (Appendix D). This form represented a more systematic and formalized manner of updating the status of F-1 visa (NRA) students. The MDCC Student Number and the Social Security Number traces, while useful for tracking U. S. citizen and Immigrant Alien students, were not applicable in the case of NRAs.

The Student Status Form documents contained what promised to be the key identifier which would link MDCC NRA with INS records. This identifier, the INS Admission Number on the Student Status Form is found also on the I20 Immigration Application Form. Although for the 1985-86 Report Year, the State no longer requires that NRA completers remain a component of the Placement Pool, those who are of known "successful placements" can be included in the Pool (total number of program graduates). For programs showing marginal program review success ratios (60%-70%), the location of heretofore unknown NRA graduates (who are working in a field related to program training or continuing education), could be vital to the continuity of program funding.

Hence, in spite of the lifting of State requirements, this potential source of information through the INS Admissions Number was pursued for applicability in subsequent years. However, immigration officers queried offered that it was also difficult for the INS to update the movements of visa students. Compliance to INS regulations is not altogether forthcoming from this population. Aside from that, the Privacy Act is tightly adhered to and location

information is seldom given to private individuals or institutions. Only authorized federal agencies have access to this information.

4. The State University System (SUS) Student Course Files

Feedback information on transfers to state universities comes from the SUS Student Course Files. These data are captured once yearly during the fall semester and form the basis for the education status of community college student transfers to the Florida public universities. Clearly, those who matriculate during the winter, spring, and summer do not, therefore, appear in the annual state report as continuing education unless data come from other sources. Continuing education, according to the Department of Education, Division of Community Colleges is a mark of program success for Completers or Leavers of the Advanced and Professional or occupational award programs.

Across the state among community colleges,there are chasms in data on Associate in Arts transfers essential for research purposes. When one considers that community college students are unlike the traditional student with regard to the continuity and "full-timeness" of enrollment, it is very likely that the three missing term tapes would reveal substantial numbers of hidden matriculants. Notwithstanding redundancy, MDCC fall term SUS data contain only data selected from the field called "last school of transfer." If a student transferred from MDCC to another Florida community college before finally enrolling in the SUS, as for instance to Broward Community College (BCC), when the fall tapes are produced, this student would be shown in this field as having transferred from BCC. The fact that he may have completed the major portion of his program at MDCC has no bearing in this tape field set-up. He is credited solely as a BCC transfer. Likewise, the reverse is true. For the period of May 1985 to May 1986, Broward Community College had 871 MDCC transfer students. Quite aside from their nature (whether leavers or graduates, sequential or concurrent students, educational intent, etc), the paucity of data about the movements of of community college students within the system, severely inhibits the depth to which research possibilities can reach or worse yet, the accuracy of transfer data.

Employer Survey

The instrument "Employer Evaluation Scale" was developed for threefold purposes: 1) To satisfy state requirements, and 2) to ascertain employers opinions regarding employee satisfaction, and more importantly, 3) to determine employer needs. In an era of rapidly changing technology, annual employer surveys may show a pattern indicating the changing needs of the labor market and the state of the art. The instrument was both pilot-tested on selected programs and appraised by occupational program administrators.

1. Reactions of Administrators to the Employer Evaluation Scale

While the returns from the employers of the pilot-tested Employer Evaluation Scale (EES) provided essential data, the opinions of the deans of occupational programs and chairpersons of occupational

Table 3

SUMMARY OF THE REACTIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS
OF OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS
TO THE "EMPLOYER EVALUATION SCALE"

ITEM	USEFUL No.	USEFUL %	COMMENTS
3. (Job Performance)			
a. Technical Knowledge	31	89	Must be evaluated by 1st line supervisor
b. Work attitude	30	86	
c. Work quality	30	86	
d. Work quantity	30	86	
e. Willingness to learn	31	89	
f. Acceptance of responsibility	32	91	
g. Compliance with rules	29	83	
h. Work attendance	32	91	Is this really needed?
i. Punctuality in completing tasks	28	80	Efficiency in completing task(s)
j. Cooperation with management	29	83	
k. Cooperation with co-workers	31	89	
l. Following instructions	31	89	
m. Communication skills	31	89	
n. Mathematical skills	28	80	Add analytical & problem solving skills
o. Organizational skills	29	83	
p. Skill in operating equipment	27	77	
q. Overall job performance	31	89	
4. (Employment Outlook)			
Present	27	77	Not sure employer would know this
Future	27	77	Define retrenchment
5. (State of Florida Required Comparison)	17	49	
6. (Hiring Source)	27	77	
7. (Skills Suggestions)	23	66	Should be a check list
8. (Training Suggestions)	24	69	We don't train, we educate

Number Surveyed = 39
Number Respondents= 35 (90%)

General Comments:

1. Excellent.
2. May result in litigation initiated by employee.
3. A.O.K.
4. Seems comprehensive.
5. Items b, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l are not part of program training except possibly as a by-product.
6. How do these questions help me as a program manager?
7. Seems to be an attitudinal assessment.
8. Include reason to support opinion for job outlook (as conditions in industry, economy, company).
9. Cannot change work attitude, quality or quantity in the classroom; unable to teach responsibility or cooperation; scale is too long
10. Survey covers most of the areas desired
11. Seems comprehensive and all aspects should provide useful information
12. Overall, I like the form and format
13. Does employer have other Miami-Dade Community College graduates in their department?

programs were also solicited (Appendix E,F). It was assumed that the input from these persons would provide data valuable for instrument refinement and increase the empirical quality of the data in meeting the needs of occupational chairpersons.

Of the thirty-nine persons whose evaluations of the scale were solicited, 35 persons (90%) responded. Modal rating for the usefulness of the details of job performance was 89%. The specific rating categories and results are found in Table 3. The Employer Evaluation Scale contained data required by the State of Florida and was expanded to include data needed at MDCC. Characteristics measured were either directly taught in the program courses or indirectly fostered by course criteria and expectation levels. Nonetheless, these characteristics are believed significant for quality productivity.

Administrator reactions centered around the relevance of the scale to their particular program. Opinion of lack of specific program relevance was noted as "not useful" by the rater. Suggestions to increase usefulness were offered alongside the variable in the comment column. Each comment listed under general comments represents the contribution of one person. Because the scale was developed to generally cover all employers of all occupational programs, it logically could not be criterion-referenced specifically to any one program. This latter quality was accommodated in the "Not Applicable" response column of the EES. Modifications to the scale can be seen in Appendix H. The length of employment, in months, was added to the scale.

2. The Privacy Act and Company Disclosure Policy

In a memorandum dated January 15,1979 from Lee. G. Henderson (then Director of the Division of Community Colleges) to Community College Presidents (Appendix I), the issue of contacting employers of former students was discussed. The interpretation of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 was interpreted by the Division to allow the contact of employers regarding the evaluation of employees without obtaining permission from the employee to do so. This interpretation stemmed from the advice of the Fair Information staff of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which stated that "if the directory information contains language indicating the fact of graduation, the college may contact an employer concerning a former student's on-the-job evaluation without getting additional permission from the former students." This allowability was further verified by the then Vice-President for Educational Services in an administrative memorandum dated January 30,1979 (Appendix J).

The Office of Institutional Research has until the 1984-85 State Report Year secured permission directly from the employee for this contact. A contingency of factors eventuated in a return rate of employer survey responses of approximately 5% across

the years. Two categories of conditions limited the return rates:

a. The former student must have:
   1) received the Survey of Former Student questionnaire through the postal services,
   2) responded to the questionnaire and returned it,
   3) given permission to the college to have the job performance reviewed,
   4) been employed in a field related to training,
   5) completed employer's name and address accurately, and
   6) notated current supervisor contact information.

b. The employer must have:
   1) had no policy forbidding disclosure,
   2) decided to honor the request, and
   3) returned the evaluation in time for processing.

In 1985-86 the postal mailer survey (Appendix A) supplanted the Survey of Former Student form (Appendix K). Employer contact was implied in the former. Without direct permission, the fact of employment relationship to training initiated the sending of the Employer Follow-up Form, an employer survey required by the State of Florida. Return rates from employers was 31.5%. Only one employer within this group surveyed (N=345) imposed a company disclosure policy. Some enterprises requested that the employee give written consent while other companies firmly refused to disclose any information whatsoever.

Among the pilot Employer Evaluation Scale survey employers (N=131), only one employer indicated a disclosure policy. Four employees were involved in this latter group. Permission was requested of the employee (Appendix L). Again, follow-up telephone calls were necessitated. The difficulty of getting through to the employee adds to the expenditure of time and personnel quite aside from not obtaining the permission.

In a word, the Privacy Act interpretation facilitates the increase in the employer survey return rate while the Company Disclosure Policy decreases it.

3. The Employer Evaluation Scale

Five major programs covering the variability of vocational programs were selected for global surveying. These programs were Nursing ADN, Business Data Processing, Executive Secretary, Electronics Technology, and Fire Science. Many respondents to the postal mailer who were employed in fields related to their training offered addresses of employers for employer survey contact. This supply source of supervisors name proved useful. The questionnaire used in conjunction with the postal mailer was the "Employer Follow-up Form" (Appendix M). Only the graduates of the five programs named above who:

a. did not respond to the postal mailer survey of former students and
b. were in related employment as determined by the CIP/SIC bridge and
c. had usable employer addresses as supplied by the Department of Commerce tape or
d. had employers who did not respond to the Employer Follow-up Form

were sent the new instrument, the EES. Table 4 gives the characteristics of the population surveyed with this latter instrument. The extreme right columns represent the base population surveyed. For example, sixty-five employers were sent questionnaires in the Nursing program. In totality, 131 employers were intensely surveyed.

The Placement rates on the same table are cited to show that across three years, two major programs (Business Data Processing, Electronics Technology) are marginal to the 70% Program Review criteria. The lack of employment data (No Address column) for these programs---38% and 33% respectively influence program survival. No CIP/SIC code matches can be made. A number of MDCC programs that are not involved in this pilot study show marginal success rates, similarly, due largely to no address and, therefore, of unknown placement status if no SUS match can be made either.

Two weeks subsequent to mailouts, employers who did not respond were contacted by telephone. The telephone follow-up posed numerous problems:

a. The Department of Labor and Commerce tape may
   1) contain no telephone number for the company
   2) have a tax office address or headquarter address out of state for a local company under another name and with numerous branches.
b. The firm may be decentralized with no record of who is employed at the different branches.
c. No Miami telephone number is available in the directory.
d. The telephone is disconnected with no reference lead.
e. The answering service is the only contact and calls are not returned.
f. The parent corporation may have branches,each with a different name.
g. The individual was never employed there.
h. The individual was employed for only a short time.
i. The evaluating supervisor is no longer employed there.
j. No record of employment is found (may be due to name changes).

With persistance and inordinate expenditure of time, most employers (71) were finally contacted by telephone. The number of calls made to employers amounted to 134 calls for an average of 1.78 calls per employer. This average may appear low because some employers may have had as many as 6 MDCC graduates employed

Table 4

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAMS SURVEYED
with the
EMPLOYER EVALUATION SCALE

M-DCC Pgm Code	Title of Program	Number Grads	Placement Rate* 1982	1983	1984	No Address No.	%	Unrelated Employment No.	%	Responses to State Survey No.	%	Base Population No.	% of Grads
82	Nursing ADN	99	88%	108%**	82%	16	16.2	4	4.0	14	14.1	65	65.7
55	Bus.Data Proc.	55	66%	89%	61%	21	38.2	13	23.6	6	10.9	15	27.3
K7	Exec. Secretary	43	81%	94%	81%	9	20.9	2	4.7	12	27.9	20	46.5
56	Electronics Tech	51	66%	105%**	63%	17	33.3	12	23.5	3	5.9	19	37.3
T1	Fire Science	20	86%	100%	89%	4	20.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	12	60.0
	TOTAL	268	-	-	-	67	25.0	33	12.3	37	13.8	131	48.9

* Success ratio of 70% (placement rate) is required by the State of Florida. Rates include Completers who are continuing education or who are in employment related to their field of training. Rates may reflect duplicated status of an individual.

** For this year, the State counted graduates twice if they were employed in field and continuing their education.

by them in a given year. The amount of time consumed in trying to locate a plausible, feasible telephone number needs also to be taken into account. A "second request" questionnaire was then mailed after explaining the purposes and (hopefully) securing their cooperation. Because of the lack of specificity oftentimes in the first mailout (immediate supervisor's name unavailability), the initial questionnaire may not have gotten to the proper department. Fifty-five (73%) second request questionnaires were sent.

Employer Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale Survey

Tables 5 to 10 are summaries of the responses to the EES regarding the quality of performance and personal characteristics of MDCC graduates in their employ. Table 5 shows the aggregated summary of the five programs studied in depth --- Nursing ADN, Secretarial Science, Business Data Processing Computer Programming, Electronics Technology, and Fire Science. Of the 131 questionnaires sent, 92 employers (70%) responded. The willingness to learn category received the highest percentage of excellent ratings (63.1%). In an era of rapid changes, it is not surprising that this is a well-valued characteristic. Other categories receiving nearly as high an excellent rating were work attendance (59.7%), cooperation with management (56.0%) and cooperation with co-workers (54.0%). Categories receiving the highest good ratings were technical knowledge (54.4%), communication skills (53.2%), organization skills (52.7%), and skills in operating equipment (48.7%). These specific employer evaluations are consistent with reports and research studies over the past current years regarding trends and valuations in the labor market. Overall total superior ratings (excellent/good) for the aggregation of programs for MDCC graduates in 1985-86 was 86.9%.

On page 2 of Table 5,employers were roughly divided by thirds in their rating of the performance of MDCC graduates compared to those without training. This rating item which is required by the State is a moot comparison. In many occupational programs, particularly those associated with the health field, licensure is required. Licensure would not be feasible without training and examination certification. Table 5 also shows that most graduates obtained their employment as a result of their own initiative (63.8%) rather than through the aid of various external hiring sources.

Table 6 deals with the Nursing ADN program. Of the 65 employers who were sent the EES, 46 (71%) responded. However, only 39 responses were usable. Total rating for all categories showed 82.7% responses excellent or good. Only 1% of employer ratings indicated dissatisfaction with employment performance of MDCC ADN graduates in 1985-86. Looking at specific categories, the highest percent rating for excellent (55.3%) was in the willingness to learn category. The highest rating for good (56.8%) was for technical knowledge. Combined superior ratings

Table 5

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Aggregation of Programs

ITEM 3. JOB PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Category	Does Not Apply		Ratings								N
			Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
a. Technical knowledge*	3	4.4	26	38.2	37	54.4	1	1.5	1	1.5	68
b. Work attitude*			40	51.3	28	35.9	9	11.5	1	1.3	78
c. Work quality*			34	43.6	34	43.6	10	12.8			78
d. Work quantity	1	1.3	32	41.0	34	43.6	11	14.1			78
e. Willingess to learn			48	63.1	23	30.3	5	6.6			76
f. Acceptance of responsibility			41	51.9	28	35.4	10	12.7			79
g. Compliance with rules			41	53.9	25	32.9	10	13.2			76
h. Work attendance			46	59.7	24	31.2	4	5.2	3	3.9	77
i. Punctuality in completing tasks	1	1.3	32	41.0	35	44.8	8	10.3	2	2.6	78
j. Cooperation with management			42	56.0	26	34.7	7	9.3			75
k. Cooperation with co-workers			41	54.0	26	34.2	9	11.8			76
l. Following instructions			32	41.5	34	44.2	11	14.3			77
m. Communication skills			25	32.5	41	53.2	9	11.7	2	2.6	77
n. Mathematical skills	15	20.1	22	29.3	34	45.3	4	5.3			75
o. Organizational skills	2	2.6	21	27.6	40	52.7	12	15.8	1	1.3	76
p. Skills in operating equipment	4	5.4	28	37.8	36	48.7	6	8.1			74
q. Overall job performance*			33	43.4	36	47.4	7	9.2			76
Total Rating	26	2.0	584	45.1	541	41.8	133	10.3	10	0.8	1294

*State of Florida required rating.

N = 131
Returns = 92
Usable Returns = 78

Table 5

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Aggregation of Programs
(continued)

ITEM 4. OPINION OF EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

	Present		Future	
Category	No.	%	No.	%
Appreciable growth				
Slight decrease	(Not apropos for aggregation)			
Steady state				
Slight decline				
Retrenchment				
Total				

ITEM 5. RATING OF PERFORMANCE WITH vs. WITHOUT TRAINING*

Category	Number	Percent
No basis for comparison	23	32.8
Individual is better prepared	20	28.6
Both are about the same	27	38.6
Individual is less prepared		
Total	70	100.0

ITEM 6. PRIMARY HIRING SOURCE

Category	Number	Percent
Employment agency	1	1.5
College faculty member	1	1.5
College job placement office		
Company recruitment	8	11.6
Mutual acquaintance	5	7.2
Individual applied on own initiative	44	63.8
Don't know	5	7.2
Other	5	7.2
Total	69	100.0

*State of Florida required rating.

IR239 85/6

for this category was 75.7%.

Fifty percent of the employers indicated appreciable growth for the present and future outlook for employment in this field. While the lauds confirm that there is a good match between college training and employer satisfaction, comments and recommendations of employers are markedly revealing (Appendix N). Verbatim suggestions from numerous Dade County health care facilities, directors of nursing, physicians, and head nurses indicate, in general, desire for intensification of curriculum emphases in clinical/preceptorship training and management skills. Students who graduated from the program and are employed in the field confirm these recommendaions as shown in the annual Survey of Former Students questionnaire.

Table 7 presents the response summary by employers for the Secretarial Science program. Of the 20 employers to whom the questionnaire was sent, 14 of them responded (70%). Eleven of these responses were usable. Cooperation with management was chosen by 91% of emplyers for the excellence rating, followed by willingness to learn at 81.8%. High excellent ratings were given for work attitude, acceptance of responsibility, compliance with rules and cooperation with co-workers. It appears that graduates of the Secretarial Science program are well socialized into employer expectations. The combined superior ratings were 89.3%. Employment outlook for secretaries is projected to either increase slightly or to grow appreciably by 80% of respondents both for the present and in the future. Employers suggested teaching computer skills and writing skills in Spanish.

The employer evaluation summary for Business Data Processing Computer Programming is found in Table 8. Nine of the fifteen employers in this field responded (60%). Eight returns were usable. Five categories (willingness to learn, acceptance of responsibility, compliance with rules, cooperation with management, and cooperation with co-workers) received 50% or higher excellent ratings. Several of these same categories received the balance of the ratings for good. Graduates from this program, while diversified in employment opportunities may not (at least at the entry level), be required to utilize skills proportionate to skills developed during their college training. Employers were in accord with the thrust of messages from futurists regarding growth in the computer technology field despite the immediate temporary lull. In regard to job performance with versus without training in this field, 50% of employers thought that the work quality of those who were trained exceeded those who received no training. Employers suggested that this program include time management, organizational skills and technical training in computer repair.

Table 6

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Nursing ADN Program
1985-86

ITEM 3. JOB PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Category	Does Not Apply		Ratings								N
			Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
a. Technical knowledge*			7	18.9	21	56.8	8	21.6	1	2.7	37
b. Work attitude*			18	46.2	14	35.9	6	15.4	1	2.5	39
c. Work quality*			11	28.2	21	53.9	7	17.9			39
d. Work quantity			11	28.2	19	48.7	9	23.1			39
e. Willingess to learn			21	55.3	14	36.8	3	7.9			38
f. Acceptance of responsibility			17	43.6	16	41.0	6	15.4			39
g. Compliance with rules			17	44.7	15	39.5	6	15.8			38
h. Work attendance			19	50.0	15	39.4	2	5.3	2	5.3	38
i. Punctuality in completing tasks			14	35.9	17	43.6	6	15.4	2	5.1	39
j. Cooperation with management			16	42.1	17	44.7	5	13.2			38
k. Cooperation with co-workers			19	51.4	12	32.4	6	16.2			37
l. Following instructions			13	34.2	17	44.7	8	21.1			38
m. Communication skills			10	26.3	20	52.6	8	21.1			38
n. Mathematical skills	4	11.1	10	27.8	19	52.8	3	8.3			36
o. Organizational skills			8	21.6	20	54.1	8	21.6	1	2.7	37
p. Skills in operating equipment			9	25.0	22	61.1	5	13.9			36
q. Overall job performance*			9	23.1	25	64.1	5	12.8			39
Total Rating	4	0.6	229	35.5	304	47.2	101	15.7	7	1.0	645

*State of Florida required rating.

N = 65
Returns = 46 (71%)
Usable Returns = 39

Table 6
1985-86
Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Nursing ADN Program
(continued)

ITEM 4. OPINION OF EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

	Present		Future	
Category	No.	%	No.	%
Appreciable growth	19	52.8	16	50.0
Slight decrease	5	13.9	6	18.8
Steady state	10	27.8	5	15.6
Slight decline	2	5.5	5	15.6
Retrenchment	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	36	100.0	32	100.0

ITEM 5. RATING OF PERFORMANCE WITH vs. WITHOUT TRAINING*

Category	Number	Percent
No basis for comparison	10	27.8
Individual is better prepared	4	11.1
Both are about the same	22	61.1
Individual is less prepared	0	0.0
Total	36	100.0

ITEM 6. PRIMARY HIRING SOURCE

Category	Number	Percent
Employment agency	0	0.0
College faculty member	0	0.0
College job placement office	0	0.0
Company recruitment	4	10.8
Mutual acquaintance	2	5.4
Individual applied on own initiative	27	73.0
Don't know	1	2.7
Other	3	8.1
Total	37	100.0

*State of Florida required rating.

Table 7

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Secretarial Science Program

ITEM 3. JOB PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Category	Does Not Apply		Ratings								N
			Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
a. Technical knowledge*	1	9.0	6	54.7	3	27.3	1	9.0			11
b. Work attitude*			8	72.7	3	27.3					11
c. Work quality*			6	54.6	4	36.4	1	9.0			11
d. Work quantity			6	54.6	4	36.4	1	9.0			11
e. Willingess to learn			9	81.8	2	18.2					11
f. Acceptance of responsibility			8	72.7	3	27.3					11
g. Compliance with rules			8	72.7	3	27.3					11
h. Work attendance			7	63.7	3	27.3			1	9.0	11
i. Punctuality in completing tasks			6	54.6	4	36.4	1	9.0			11
j. Cooperation with management			10	91.0	1	9.0					11
k. Cooperation with co-workers			8	72.8	2	18.2	1	9.0			11
l. Following instructions			6	54.6	4	36.4	1	9.0			11
m. Communication skills			5	45.4	4	36.4			2	18.2	11
n. Mathematical skills	4	36.4	2	18.2	4	36.4	1	9.0			11
o. Organizational skills			5	45.5	5	45.5	1	9.0			11
p. Skills in operating equipment	3	27.3	5	45.4	3	27.3					11
q. Overall job performance*			7	63.7	3	27.3	1	9.0			11
Total Rating	8	4.3	112	59.9	55	29.4	9	4.8	3	1.6	187

*State of Florida required rating.

N = 20
Responses = 14 (70%)
Usable Responses = 11

Table 7

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Secretarial Science Program
(continued)

ITEM 4. OPINION OF EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

	Present		Future	
Category	No.	%	No.	%
Appreciable growth	4	40.0	4	50.0
Slight increase	4	40.0	4	50.0
Steady state	2	20.0		
Slight decline				
Retrenchment				
Total	10	100.0	8	100.0

ITEM 5. RATING OF PERFORMANCE WITH vs. WITHOUT TRAINING*

Category	Number	Percent
No basis for comparison	4	36.4
Individual is better prepared	6	54.6
Both are about the same	1	9.0
Individual is less prepared		
Total	11	100.0

ITEM 6. PRIMARY HIRING SOURCE

Category	Number	Percent
Employment agency		
College faculty member		
College job placement office		
Company recruitment		
Mutual acquaintance	2	20.0
Individual applied on own initiative	4	40.0
Don't know	3	30.0
Other	1	10.0
Total	10	100.0

*State of Florida required rating.

IR239 85/6

Table 8

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Business Data Processing Computer Programming Program

ITEM 3. JOB PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Category	Does Not Apply		Ratings								N
			Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
a. Technical knowledge*	2	25.0	2	25.0	4	50.0					8
b. Work attitude*			2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0			8
c. Work quality*			3	37.5	4	50.0	1	12.5			8
d. Work quantity	1	12.5	2	25.0	4	50.0	1	12.5			8
e. Willingess to learn			4	57.1	1	14.3	2	28.6			7
f. Acceptance of responsibility			4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0			8
g. Compliance with rules			4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0			8
h. Work attendance			5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25.0			8
i. Punctuality in completing tasks	1	12.5	3	37.5	3	37.5	1	12.5			8
j. Cooperation with management			4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0			8
k. Cooperation with co-workers			4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0			8
l. Following instructions			3	37.5	4	50.0	1	12.5			8
m. Communication skills			3	37.5	4	50.0	1	12.5			8
n. Mathematical skills	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5					8
o. Organizational skills	1	12.5	3	37.5	3	37.5	1	12.5			8
p. Skills in operating equipment	1	12.5	3	37.5	3	37.5	1	12.5			8
q. Overall job performance*			3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7			6
Total Rating	9	6.8	54	40.6	48	36.1	22	16.5			133

*State of Florida required rating.

N = 15
Returns = 9 (60%)
Usable Returns = 8

Table 8

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Business Data Processing Computer Programming Program
(continued)

ITEM 4. OPINION OF EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

	Present		Future	
Category	No.	%	No.	%
Appreciable growth	1	14.3	3	42.8
Slight increase	2	28.6	1	14.3
Steady state	3	42.8	2	28.6
Slight decline	1	14.3	1	14.3
Retrenchment				
Total	7	100.0	7	100.0

ITEM 5. RATING OF PERFORMANCE WITH vs. WITHOUT TRAINING*

Category	Number	Percent
No basis for comparison	2	25.0
Individual is better prepared	4	50.0
Both are about the same	2	25.0
Individual is less prepared		
Total	8	100.0

ITEM 6. PRIMARY HIRING SOURCE

Category	Number	Percent
Employment agency	1	12.5
College faculty member		
College job placement office		
Company recruitment	1	12.5
Mutual acquaintance	1	12.5
Individual applied on own initiative	4	50.0
Don't know	1	12.5
Other		
Total	8	100.0

*State of Florida required rating.

IR239 85/6

Table 9

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Electronics Technology Program

ITEM 3. JOB PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Category	Does Not Apply		Ratings								N
			Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
a. Technical knowledge*			5	55.6	4	44.4					9
b. Work attitude*			5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1			9
c. Work quality*			7	77.6	1	11.1	1	11.1			9
d. Work quantity			6	66.7	3	33.3					9
e. Willingess to learn			7	77.6	2	22.2					9
f. Acceptance of responsibility			5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1			9
g. Compliance with rules			5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2			9
h. Work attendance			8	88.9	1	11.1					9
i. Punctuality in completing tasks			3	33.3	6	66.7					9
j. Cooperation with management			6	66.7	1	11.1	2	22.2			9
k. Cooperation with co-workers			4	44.4	5	55.6					9
l. Following instructions			3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1			9
m. Communication skills			1	11.1	8	88.9					9
n. Mathematical skills	2	22.2	3	33.3	4	44.5					9
o. Organizational skills	1	11.1	1	11.1	6	66.7	1	11.1			9
p. Skills in operating equipment			5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1			9
q. Overall job performance*			7	77.8	2	22.2					9
Total Rating	3	2.0	81	52.9	59	38.6	10	6.5			153

*State of Florida required rating.

N = 19
Returns = 12 (63%)
Usable Returns = 9

Table 9

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Electronics Technology Program
(continued)

ITEM 4. OPINION OF EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

	Present		Future	
Category	No.	%	No.	%
Appreciable growth	2	20.0	4	44.5
Slight increase	4	40.0	3	33.3
Steady state	4	40.0	1	11.1
Slight decline			1	11.1
Retrenchment				
Total	10	100.0	9	100.0

ITEM 5. RATING OF PERFORMANCE WITH vs. WITHOUT TRAINING*

Category	Number	Percent
No basis for comparison	3	30.0
Individual is better prepared	5	50.0
Both are about the same	2	20.0
Individual is less prepared		
Total	10	100.0

ITEM 6. PRIMARY HIRING SOURCE

Category	Number	Percent
Employment agency		
College faculty member	1	11.1
College job placement office		
Company recruitment	3	33.3
Mutual acquaintance		
Individual applied on own initiative	4	44.5
Don't know		
Other	1	11.1
Total	9	100.0

*State of Florida required rating.

IR239 85/6

Table 10

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Fire Science Program

ITEM 3. JOB PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Category	Does Not Apply		Ratings								N
			Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
a. Technical knowledge*			6	54.5	5	45.5					11
b. Work attitude*			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
c. Work quality*			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
d. Work quantity			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
e. Willingess to learn			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
f. Acceptance of responsibility			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
g. Compliance with rules			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
h. Work attendance			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
i. Punctuality in completing tasks			6	54.5	5	45.5					11
j. Cooperation with management			6	54.5	5	45.5					11
k. Cooperation with co-workers			6	54.5	5	45.5					11
l. Following instructions			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
m. Communication skills			6	54.6	5	45.5					11
n. Mathematical skills	2	18.1	5	45.5	4	36.4					11
o. Organizational skills			4	36.4	6	54.5	1	9.1			11
p. Skills in operating equipment			6	54.5	5	45.5					11
q. Overall job performance*			7	63.6	4	36.4					11
Total Rating	2	1.1	108	57.8	76	40.6	1	0.5			187

*State of Florida required rating.

N = 12
Returns = 12 (100%)
Usable Returns = 11

Table 10

Summary of Responses to the Employer Evaluation Scale
For the
Fire Science Program
(continued)

ITEM 4. OPINION OF EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

	Present		Future	
Category	No.	%	No.	%
Appreciable growth	1	9.1	3	27.2
Slight increase	4	36.4	4	36.4
Steady state	6	54.5	4	36.4
Slight decline				
Retrenchment				
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0

ITEM 5. RATING OF PERFORMANCE WITH vs. WITHOUT TRAINING*

Category	Number	Percent
No basis for comparison	4	80.0
Individual is better prepared	1	20.0
Both are about the same		
Individual is less prepared		
Total	5	100.0

ITEM 6. PRIMARY HIRING SOURCE

Category	Number	Percent
Employment agency		
College faculty member		
College job placement office		
Company recruitment		
Mutual acquaintance		
Individual applied on own initiative	5	100.0
Don't know		
Other		
Total	5	100.0

*State of Florida required rating.

IR239 85/6

Table 9 summarizes the responses to the EES for the Electronics Technology program. Twelve (63%) of the nineteen questionnaires sent were returned. Nine of the responses were usable. The highest rating of excellent was for work attendance (88.9%). Communication skills were rated good for 88.9% of employees. Overall excellent performance rating was calculated at 77.8%. Only one person was given a total average rating and none was rated poor. Overall job performance for the excellent/good combination was 100%. More than 60% of employers viewed the present and future employment opportunities as of slight or appreciable growth. Nearly half of employers noted that the primary source for hiring was either the result of college faculty connections or company recruitment. Individual initiative netted the other half of jobs in the electronics field. Employers suggested training or more training in computers, micro-processors, robotics, fiber-optics, and manufacturing management.

The Fire Science program is seen in Table 10. Excellent and good ratings for variables were relatively stable across categories. Total superior ratings equaled 100%. Most employers perceived that employment outlook had achieved a steady state and that future growth would not warrant expansionistic activities. Employers also saw little basis for comparison between job performance with versus without training. Many programs are of such technical nature and becoming increasingly specialized that this type of comparison sheds little useful information.

Discussion

In addition to the traditional methods for data collection, notwithstanding State supplied data, and in spite of MDCC's elaborate structure of code matches, assignment of placement status for program graduates does not exceed 80%. To deal with the remaining 20% of graduates for which no data are available and upon whose whereabouts continued program existence may be crucial, "non-traditionnal" methods were explored. The five areas thus delved into included data possibilities from 1) in-state private university transfers, 2) out-of-state university transfers, 3) Immigration and Naturalization Services files, 4) SUS Student Course files transfers, and 5) methodological, instrumental changes in surveys to employers.

Each of these approaches required intensive telephone follow-through and each presented new sets of problems that were convergent or divergent of limitations of conventional methodology. Requests to in-state private universities and out-of-state universities yielded data designed within the framework and needs of the institutions themselves. Consequently, data supplied, more often than not, were not immediately usable for MDCC requirements. This was partly also the result of the nature of community college populations. The part-time student status, frequency of dropping in and out, and residential instability added to the difficulty of matching the year of matriculation in the university with the year of graduation from MDCC. But while a one-to-one match posed difficulties, correspondence with the registrars of institutions of higher learning together with campus-based special programs yielded data attesting to MDCC transfers in such institutions as the University of Chicago, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Smith College, and Purdue University. To illustrate the difficulty, Purdue University noted 104 MDCC transfers. It will, however, not be an easy task to match them by year of last attendance at MDCC.

A source of data which would be enormously helpful for MDCC research in many realms reside in the SUS Term tape files. The SUS tapes contain a field for last institution attended before SUS transfer. These data are available to the community colleges for the Fall Term only. With access to the Winter and Spring/Summer Term tapes for each academic year, it is possible to capture transfer data that increases the accuracy of transfer data reported to the State, not to mention the hosts of other research possibilities these tapes offer.

Omitted from these tapes are the names of other institutions attended prior to the last. Credit for continuing education is, therefore, confined to the last reported institution. Because of this, no determination can be made concerning volume of courses taken at other institutions, intent of enrollment or whether matriculation is sequential or concurrent in the two community colleges that might be involved. The inclusion of fields indicating all Florida community colleges attended prior to SUS transfer enhances the accuracy of data within each institution and would allow for long overdue research.

The INS files were investigated as a possible source of Non-Resident Alien follow-up data. While a match between college files and the INS Admissions files can be effected, location data is available only to federal agencies and this stricture is adhered to stringently.

The Employer Evaluation Scale (EES) proved useful in monitoring employee performance as well as in uncovering data applicable to specific programs. Suggestions by employers indicated changes in the state-of-the-art and in the state-of-the-market. However, the overall return rate of 70% for the 131 questionnaires that were sent (versus the 5% return rate of the Employer Follow-up Form)represented an extraordinary effort in terms of time and personnel involved. Despite its success and usefulness, with approximately 1,000 Associate in Science graduates annually, such an intensive concentration of effort, as was expended in this pilot study, would be beyond present resources availability.

On a national scale, community colleges share similar follow-up problems on a degree continuum. However great the efforts of institutions, in the final analysis, responsiveness to the needs of the college by the former student is a significant means of securing data needed. The question then, in this regard, is in what additional ways, given the non-traditional nature of the community college student, can the institution foster greater future interaction while the student is still a matriculant? What efficient and cost effective mechanism can be installed in secure all three SUS Term tapes imperative and urgent to community college research? What are the implications for programming were fields added to the SUS tapes for other community colleges attended? At which percentage cut-off would the population of the reported data be representative of the population in the unknown status category? Could not, at this point, extrapolation reflect accurate outcomes for both populations? How involved would it be to list on the Commerce tape specific local employer names in place of generic (interstate corporation) employer name? What safeguards can be built into an automated national system of Social Security Number matches for employment data?

These are some issues that were generated as a result of this project. They require serious consideration, further research, and dogged determination if data reported by community colleges to the State are to be accurate and meaningful for decision-making.

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Office of Institutional Research - 16
11011 S.W. 104th Street
Miami, Florida 33176-3393

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Miami, FL.
Permit No. 315

Appendix A

Postal Mailer

Tear here. Drop questionnaire half in mailbox. No postage needed.

Please take a few minutes

Dear Recent Miami-Dade Community College Completer:
Please take a few minutes to help us bring our records up-to-date.

Are you presently or have you been employed since leaving M-DCC? _____ YES _____ NO

If yes, is the work related to your training? _____ YES _____ NO

If you are working, provide the name and address of your employer whom we will contact.

Name of employer _____ Phone _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Name of immediate supervisor _____

Are you enrolled in a post-secondary education program? _____ YES _____ NO

Are you in the military? _____ YES _____ NO

31

Thank You for Helping!

10/85 IR

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE/District Administration, 11011 S.W. 104 Street, Miami, Florida 33176

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
(305) 347-2007

Appendix B

Data Request to Institutions Outside of the SUS

June 13, 1986

Mr. John Q. Pierce
Registrar
Georgetown University
37 & O Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20057

Dear Mr. Pierce:

As you know so well, finding former students is not an easy task. We are aware that our students transfer from Miami-Dade Community College to Georgetown University but have little specific data essential to research requirements or for State of Florida mandated purposes. We are in need of some help from you in this regard and are appreciative of whatever attention you are able to give to this request. The attached form outlines our data needs.

Thank you ever so much, Mr. Pierce, for your courtesy.

Sincerely,

Anne Baldwin

Anne Baldwin
Research Associate

wpc

Attachment

Miami-Dade is an equal access/equal opportunity community college
and does not discriminate on the basis of [illegible]

Appendix C

TRANSFER STUDENTS FROM MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INSTITUTION: Georgetown University
37 & O Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20057

YEARS OF TRANSFER: 1985-86, 1984-85 and 1983-84 ACADEMIC YEARS:

	Student Social Security No.	Name of Student
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		

(signature)

(title)

Appendix C

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

STUDENT STATUS FORM
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONS

SCHOOL COPY
RETAIN FOR YOUR RECORDS

APPROVED OMB 1115-0119
EXPIRES 9/30/87

SOUTH CAMPUS.

URGENT MATERIAL. IMMEDIATE ATTENTION REQUIRED.

SCHOOLS WHICH ARE APPROVED TO ENROLL F-1 AND/OR M-1 NONIMMIGRANT STUDENTS MUST PERIODICALLY REPORT THE STATUS OF THESE STUDENTS. UNDER TITLE 8, SECTION 214.3(G)(2), CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, FAILURE TO COMPLY MAY RESULT IN THE WITHDRAWAL OF PERMISSION TO ENROLL F-1 AND/OR M-1 NONIMMIGRANT STUDENTS.

FOR EACH STUDENT LISTED ON FORM I-721, INDICATE HIS/HER CURRENT STATUS BY FOLLOWING THE INSTRUCTIONS. IF YOU DESIRE TO CORRECT ANY INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDENT, YOU MAY USE THE ATTACHED FORM I-721 SUPPLEMENT FOR THAT PURPOSE.

BUT BE SURE TO REPORT THE STUDENT'S STATUS ON FORM I-721.

IF ANY F-1 OR M-1 STUDENTS ENROLLED IN YOUR SCHOOL ARE NOT LISTED ON FORM I-721, EACH MUST BE LISTED ON FORM I-721 SUPPLEMENT. FORM I-721 AND EACH SUPPLEMENT MUST BE SIGNED AND DATED BY A DESIGNATED SCHOOL OFFICIAL. (SEE LISTING BELOW.)

SCHOOL CODE- MIA214F0152.000

SCHOOL NAME- MIAMI DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ADDRESS- 11011 SW 104 STREET
MIAMI FL 33176

ALL PORTIONS OF THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLETED AND MAILED

RETURN TO: ACS/STUDENT SCHOOLS SECTION
P.O. BOX 170
LONDON, KENTUCKY 40741

DATE GENERATED: 02/25/85

ONLY THE PERSONS LISTED BELOW ARE DESIGNATED SCHOOL OFFICIALS. NO OTHER PERSON MAY SIGN.

1. ARMANDO J FERRER
2. ROSE M CAREA
3. GLORIA SIMPKINS
4. JAMES THOMAS
5. STEFANIE R SCHINOFF

TO ADD, DELETE, OR REPLACE A DESIGNATED SCHOOL OFFICIAL, SUBMIT A FORM I-17A TO THE INS OFFICE HAVING JURISDICTION OVER YOUR SCHOOL. HE/SHE WILL THEN BE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN THIS FORM.

DEFINITIONS OF REPORT HEADINGS:

OP/IR: AN "X" UNDER THIS HEADING MEANS THE STUDENT HAD PERMISSION TO ENGAGE IN PRACTICAL TRAINING ON THE DATE THIS FORM WAS GENERATED.

L/S: THE DEFINITIONS OF THESE LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF COURSE OF STUDY CODES ARE CONTAINED ON FORMS I-20A-B AND I-20M-N.

STUDENT STATUS CODES - DEFINITIONS

1-STUDENT IS ENROLLED AND PURSUING A FULL COURSE OF STUDY, OR ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:
- ON AUTHORIZED VACATION
- ENGAGED IN POST-DOCTORAL STUDY OR RESEARCH
- ENGAGED IN "COOPERATIVE STUDY" (ALTERNATE WORK/STUDY PROGRAM) AT A COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY, CONSERVATORY, OR SEMINARY
- TEMPORARILY NOT ENROLLED OR PURSUING LESS THAN A FULL COURSE OF STUDY DUE TO ILLNESS.

2-STUDENT IS ENROLLED BUT NOT PURSUING A FULL COURSE OF STUDY.

3-STUDENT IS NO LONGER ENROLLED AT THIS INSTITUTION, INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING:
- GRADUATED/COMPLETED COURSE OF STUDY
- TRANSFERRED
- WITHDREW/TERMINATED
- PARTICIPATING IN APPROVED POST-GRADUATE PRACTICAL TRAINING.

4-STUDENT WAS ADMITTED TO THE SCHOOL AND ISSUED FORM I-20A-B OR I-20M-N, BUT HAS, TO DATE, NOT ENROLLED IN THIS SCHOOL.

5-STUDENT HAS CHANGED FROM F-1 OR M-1 STATUS TO ANOTHER NONIMMIGRANT STATUS, HAS ADJUSTED TO IMMIGRANT STATUS, OR HAS OTHER INS PERMISSION TO STAY IN THE UNITED STATES (OTHER THAN F-1 OR M-1 CLASSIFICATION).

6-STUDENT HAS NOT BEEN ISSUED A FORM I-20A-B OR I-20M-N BY THIS SCHOOL.

Appendix E

Reaction Request to Administrators

May 23, 1986

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Occupational Deans
Program Managers

FROM: Anne Baldwin, Research Associate
Office of Institutional Research

SUBJECT: Employer Evaluation Scale

We are currently developing an employer survey form, as part of a grant, to assess the job performance of our former students. Your opinions regarding the items on this new form will be helpful in terms of collecting data from employers that will be useful to you.

The Employer Evaluation Scale is attached along with a form soliciting your comments on the items. We will revise the scale based on your input and use it in subsequent employer surveys.

Thank you for your efforts in improving Miami-Dade Community College's occupational programs. We have set June 5, 1986 as the deadline for processing your reactions to the Employer Evaluation Scale. Please call me if you have any questions at 2026.

AB:dp

Attachment

Appendix F

REACTION TO THE "EMPLOYER EVALUATION SCALE"

Directions: Please react to the attached Employer Evaluation Scale by indicating its usefulness (with a check in that column) or suggesting an improvement.

Item	Useful	If not useful, change to (state specifically):
3. (Job Performance)		
a. Technical knowledge		
b. Work attitude		
c. Work quality		
d. Work quantity		
e. Willingness to learn		
f. Acceptance of responsibility		
g. Compliance with rules		
h. Work attendance		
i. Punctuality in completing tasks		
j. Cooperation with management		
k. Cooperation with co-workers		
l. Following instructions		
m. Communication skills		
n. Mathematical skills		
o. Organizational skills		
p. Skill in operating equipment		
q. Overall job performance		
4. (Employment Outlook)		
Present		
Future		
5. (State of Florida Required Comparison)		
6. (Hiring Source)		
7. (Skills Suggestions)		
8. (Training Suggestions)		
Comments		

Name of M-DCC Evaluator: _____

Title: _____

Program: _____

Campus: _____

DUE DATE: JUNE 5, 1986

Prepared by: Office of Institutional Research
May 1986

AB:ab

IR224 85/6

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE/District Administration, 11011 S.W. 104 Street, Miami, Florida 33176

Appendix G

Request to Employers for Data

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
(305) 347-2007

May 1986

Dear Employer:

Each year Miami-Dade Community College conducts a review of the job preparation of its training programs. Part of this review includes feedback from employers. As a result of this review, several programs have been eliminated and others created. This process directly helps both you and us---better employees for you, goal-oriented student enrollments for us.

You have been identified as the person best able to evaluate the job performance of the individual on the attached "Employer Evaluation Scale." Your evaluation will be held in strict confidence. Neither you nor your employee will be identified personally in our research reports. Statistical analyses and summaries are intended for curricular and instructional improvement.

We need your help in completing this form and are most appreciative of whatever attention you are able to give to this request. If you have any questions, I can be reached at 347-2026.

Sincerely,

Anne Baldwin

Anne Baldwin
Research Associate

AB:ab

Attachment

IR210.1 85/6

Miami-Dade is an equal access/equal opportunity community college

Appendix H

EMPLOYER EVALUATION SCALE

Purpose: The relevance and quality of the training programs at Miami-Dade Community College can be improved with feedback on the job performance of our graduates.

Directions: Please answer the questions and check the boxes which most closely reflect your opinion of:

(1-7)

who recently received an A.S. degree in _____

(8-24) 1. What is the job title of this individual? _____

How long (in months) has this person been in this position? _____

(25) 2. What is your relationship to this individual?

| 1 | Employer

| 2 | Supervisor

| 3 | Employer and Supervisor

| 4 | Other (describe) _____

(26-42) 3. How would you rate the training received by this individual at M-DCC as evidenced by job performance:

	Does Not Apply	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
(26) a. Technical knowledge					
(27) b. Work attitude					
(28) c. Work quality					
(29) d. Work quantity					
(30) e. Willingness to learn					
(31) f. Acceptance of responsibility					
(32) g. Compliance with rules					
(33) h. Work attendance					
(34) i. Punctuality in completing tasks					
(35) j. Cooperation with management					
(36) k. Cooperation with co-workers					
(37) l. Following instructions					
(38) m. Communication skills					
(39) n. Mathematical skills					
(40) o. Organizational skills					
(41) p. Skills in operating equipment					
(42) q. Overall job performance					

4. What, in your opinion, is the job outlook for employment in this particular occupational field?

(43) Present (Next 12 Months)		(44) Future (Beyond 12 Months)
a. | |	Appreciable Growth	a. | |
b. | |	Slight Increase	b. | |
c. | |	Steady State	c. | |
d. | |	Slight Decline	d. | |
e. | |	Retrenchment	e. | |

(over)

(45) 5. As a result of this person's training, how would you rate preparation in relation to your other employees who did not receive such training?

|__| 1. No basis for comparison

|__| 2. Individual is better prepared

|__| 3. Both are about the same

|__| 4. Individual is less prepared

(46) 6. What was the primary source for the hiring of this individual? (Check one source only)

|__| 1. Employment agency

|__| 2. College faculty member

|__| 3. College job placement office

|__| 4. Company recruitment

|__| 5. Mutual acquaintance

|__| 6. Individual applied on own initiative

|__| 7. Don't know

|__| 8. Other (describe)_____

(47-70) 7. What suggestions do you have for improving the skills in this field for future M-DCC graduates?

_____

_____

(71-90) 8. What, in your opinion, are additional areas of educational training (job titles, skills, etc.) in which Miami-Dade Community College should become involved?

_____

_____

Person completing this questionnaire:

Name_____

Title_____

Company/Organization_____

Address_____

City/State/Zip Code_____

Thank you for your assistance in completing this questionnaire. A pre-paid stamped and addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

AB:ab
May, 1986

IR210 85/6

Appendix I

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

RALPH D. TURLINGTON
COMMISSIONER

TALLAHASSEE 32304

LEE G. HENDERSON
DIRECTOR
DIVISION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

January 15, 1979

MEMORANDUM

TO: Community College Presidents

FROM: Lee G. Henderson

SUBJECT: Contacting Employers of Former Students

Many colleges have interpreted the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 as prohibiting a college from contacting an employer to evaluate a former student's on-the-job performance. Because of the reluctance of the colleges to contact employers, in many cases, insufficient employer evaluations have been received to adequately answer the questions required when responding to C.C.M.I.S., AA3B, and Placement and Program Status.

Recently, one of my staff contacted the Fair Information staff of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the question of contacting employers of former students. The Fair Information staff advises us that if the college has followed the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act procedures in establishing directory information and if the directory information contains language indicating the fact of graduation, the college may contact an employer concerning a former student's on-the-job evaluation without getting additional permission from the former student.

det

cc: Council on Instructional Affairs
Council of Student Affairs
Registrars
Follow-Up and Placement Officers

an equal opportunity employer

Appendix J

January 30, 1979

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Dr. Peter Masiko, Jr.
Dr. Robert H. McCabe
Campus Vice Presidents
Student Deans
Registrars
Dr. John Losak
Mr. William Cael

FROM: J. Terence Kelly
Vice President for Educational Services

SUBJECT: CONTACTING EMPLOYERS OF FORMER STUDENTS

I have two responses to the attached memorandum:

1. Miami-Dade has not interpreted the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 as prohibiting us from contacting employers to evaluate a former student's on-the-job performance.

2. Our College policies and procedures are written so that if we wish to continue this practice we would be fully covered by our approach to implementing both state and federal regulations in this area.

JTK:jp
attachment

Survey of Former Students
Office of Institutional Research
Miami-Dade Community College

NOTE: This report is authorized by law (20 USC 2312 and 20 USC 2391). While you are not required to respond to this survey, your cooperation is needed to insure that the results of this effort are comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

DIRECTIONS

Most items can be answered by checking the appropriate box ☑. Where other information is requested, please fill in the blanks.

1. What is your current educational status?

8
- [1] Currently attending school.
- [2] Not currently attending school.

2. What is your current employment status?

9
- [1] Employed (Includes all employment even if below your qualifications. Does not include Full-time Military).
- [2] Employed (Full-time Military Service).
- [3] Unemployed (Not employed, but actively seeking employment).
- [4] Not in the labor force and not seeking employment because:

10
- [1] Personal choice
- [2] Illness
- [3] Full-time student
- [4] Retired
- [5] Pregr ancy
- [6] Other _____

3. Do you feel that you achieved your educational goal at M-DCC?

11 [1] Yes [2] No

IF CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, GO ON TO QUESTION 4. IF NOT, GO DIRECTLY TO INSTRUCTIONS AFTER QUESTION 10.

4. Is your current job related to your field of vocational training?

12
- [1] Yes, it is directly or closely related.
- [2] No, it is only remotely related or is not related at all.

If you are currently employed in a job not related to your training, please indicate the reason.

13
- [1] Was already working with present employer before I completed my vocational program.
- [2] Did not feel sufficiently qualified for a job in my field of preparation.
- [3] Preferred to work in another field.
- [4] Found better payng job in another field.
- [5] Could not find a job in my field without relocating.
- [6] Continuing education at another institution.
- [7] Continuing education at Miami-Dade Community College.
- [8] Other _____

5. How has the training you received at Miami-Dade helped you in your present job? (check all that apply)

		[1] Yes	[2] Not Applicable
14	Helped me get the job initially	☐	☐
15	Helped me do the job	☐	☐
16	Helped me do the job but additional training was required.	☐	☐
17	Helped me get a promotion or raise.	☐	☐

6. Please provide the following information on your present job: (PLEASE PRINT)

_____
Name of Company (if self employed, write SELF)

_____
Mailing Address

_____
City State Zip

Immediate supervisor:

_____
Last Name First Name

18-19
- Your job title _____
- Your job duties _____

NOTE: ☐ Put an "X" in the box if you would like to see your responses compared with the responses from other former M-DCC students.

7. What is your current salary before deductions? (Do not add overtime.)
20-26 $ _____ per _____ (hour, week, month, or year)

8. The salary in the preceding item is based on
27-28 _____ (number) hours per week employment.

9. May we contact your employer to ask for comments on how well Miami-Dade prepared you for your job?
29 [1] Yes [2] No

10. Who helped you find your current job?
30 [1] Employment Agency
[2] One of my instructors
[3] Miami-Dade Placement Office/Activities
[4] No one - I found it by myself
[5] Other, (friend, relative, etc.)

IF CURRENTLY CONTINUING YOUR EDUCATION, GO TO QUESTION 11. IF NOT, GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 14.

11. If a full-time or part-time student:
[1] I am continuing my education at **another** institution
31 [1] in a field related to my training
[2] in a field not related to my training
32-45 _____ Name of institution
_____ City State
[2] I am continuing my education at Miami-Dade Community College.
46 [1] in a field related to my training.
[2] in a field not related to my training.

12. If you are attending **another** institution, did you have problems transferring from Miami-Dade?
49 [1] Yes [2] No

13. How would you rate the preparation for continuing your education that you received at Miami-Dade.
50 [1] Excellent [3] Fair
[2] Good [4] Poor

14. Please give an overall rating of the courses that you took in your **major** field of study.

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
51	Instructor preparation	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
52	Course content	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
53	Level of presentation	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
54	Class size	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]

15. Please rate these college services according to how they fulfilled your needs.

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
55	Library	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
56	Registration procedures	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
57	Financial aid	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
58	Audio Visual services	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
59	Learning labs	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]

16. How would you rate the quality of guidance (counseling) services provided by teachers, counselors, and other school personnel for your vocational program?
[1] Received and would rate
60 [1] Very good [3] Poor
[2] Good [4] Very poor
[5] Sought services but did not receive
[8] Did not seek services.

17. How would you rate the quality of placement services provided by teachers, counselors, Placement Office or other school personnel for your vocational program?
[1] Received and would rate
61 [1] Very good [3] Poor
[2] Good [4] Very poor
[5] Sought services but did not receive
[6] Did not seek services.

18. How would you rate the quality of the educational training you received?
62 [1] Very good [3] Poor
[2] Good [4] Very poor

19. What improvements could be made at Miami-Dade to help future students?

_____
_____
_____

Institutional Research 1984
Thank you for your cooperation. Please return this survey in the envelope provided. If you have any questions, contact Anne Baldwin at Institutional Research, Miami-Dade Community College; Phone: (305) 596-1238.

Appendix L

Permission to Obtain Employer Evaluation Data

June 12, 1986

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: _____

FROM: Anne Baldwin, Research Associate

SUBJECT: EMPLOYER EVALUATION SCALE

Each year Miami-Dade Community College conducts a review of the job preparation of its training programs. Part of this State of Florida mandated review includes feedback from employers. As a result of this review, several programs have been eliminated and others created.

_____, because you have been through the entire program, M-DCC would like your permission to ask your supervisor to evaluate the relevance and quality of the _____ program. Neither you nor your employer will be identified personally in our research reports. Statistical analyses and summaries are intended for curricular and instructional improvement.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions, I can be reached at 347-2026.

(tear line)

Please fill in and return to Institutional Research, Room 1137.

I, _____ give permission to Institutional Research
(Print name)
to send my employer an Employer Evaluation Scale.

_____
(Signature)

_____
(Date)

Employee's Name:

EMPLOYER FOLLOW-UP FORM

1. VOCATIONAL TRAINING EVALUATION

Please rate the vocational training received by the individual in the following areas:

	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
a. Technical knowledge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Work attitude	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Work quality	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)

2. OVERALL RATING

What is your **overall** rating of the vocational training received by this individual as it relates to the job requirements?

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)

3. RELATIVE PREPARATION

As a result of this person's vocational training, how would you rate his or her preparation in relation to other employees in his or her work group who did not receive such training.

☐ No basis for comparison
(5) ☐ Individual is better prepared
(3) ☐ Both are about the same
(1) ☐ Individual is less prepared

4. If and when the need arises, I would be willing to hire additional employees who complete the same or similar vocational programs.

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Remarks: _____

_____

Office of Institutional Research · Miami Dade Community College 2/83

Appendix N

Comments by Employers for Program Consideration
Nursing ADN

(Items 7 and 8 of the Employer Evaluation Scale questionnaire)

Emphasize organizational skills
Understanding of surgery and drug interactions
Critical care management and basic EKG
Include in curriculum information on continuing education training
Legalities regarding home care nursing
Provide as much "hands-on" training as possible
Preceptor program is good
Understanding of staffing standard
More patient contact during training
Reality orientation
Offer B. S. degree or encourage further training
More clincial experience
Increase clinical experience
Increase clinical hours
Stronger background in medications
More instructors per student
More clinical time for improving skill performance
Extend preceptorship program to more specialties
Emphasize prioritization and ability to handle volume
Work more on organizational skills and problem solving
Lengthen preceptorship
More clinical
Team leading skills
Extend clinical time requirement
Professional manner in dealing with doctors
More clinical experience
Provide time for reality orientation in the curriculum
Communication and listening skills
Management skills
IV classes